

'Nature' attacks the BBC for its U-turn over climate change

By [Damian Thompson](#) [World](#) Last updated: October 12th, 2009

[63 Comments](#) [Comment on this article](#)

The BBC's change of mind over global warming has upset the journal Nature, whose blog accuses the Beeb of lending credibility to sceptics by admitting that the planet stopped heating up in 1998 and taking seriously the arguments of scientists who believe that cooling will continue for 30 years.

[As I reported yesterday](#), Paul Hudson, BBC News climate change correspondent, published an article entitled "Whatever happened to global warming?" at the end of last week. Hudson hasn't joined the ranks of sceptics or deniers, but he does say that the planet stopped warming *before the turn of the millennium*, and reports that some climatologists believe that this is linked to an ocean cooling cycle that will last for decades.

Heresy! Nature's blog "The Great Beyond" is very cross, accusing Hudson of being "slightly disingenuous" in claiming that the debate over global warming is "hotting up". But the debate *is* gathering pace, even if its terms keep shifting as new data become available. So what exactly has Hudson done wrong?

The intro to [the Nature blog post](#), by Daniel Cressey, positively splutters with indignation:

Given that they occupy a position on the scientific credibility spectrum that could charitably be characterised as 'fringe', it is no surprise that those who deny climate change have to take their victories where they find them.

And I, apparently, am "leading the charge" by reporting the BBC's surreptitious change of heart on this blog. But I don't "deny climate change" and never have. So who exactly is being disingenuous here?